SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURA VENTURA DIVISION

TENTATIVE RULINGS

JUDICIAL OFFICER: Kevin DeNoce

CASE NUM: 56-2015-00474418-CU-MC-VTA
CASE TITLE: HARBOUR ISLAND VS GRIFFITHS

CASE CATEGORY: Civil - Unlimited CASE TYPE: Misc Complaints - Other

EVENT TYPE: Motion to Compel - Responses by pltf to Defs request for prod. set two

CAUSAL DOCUMENT/DATE FILED: Motion to Compel, 11/14/2016

The morning calendar in courtroom 43 will begin at 9 a.m. Cases including *ex parte* matters will not be called prior to 9 a.m. Please check in with the courtroom clerk by no later than 8:45 a.m. If appearing by CourtCall, please call in between 8:35 and 8:45 a.m.

With respect to the below scheduled tentative ruling, no notice of intent to appear is required. If you wish to submit on the tentative decision, you can send an email to the court at: Courtroom43@ventura.courts.ca.gov or send a telefax to Judge DeNoce's secretary, Hellmi McIntyre at 805-477-5894, stating that you submit on the tentative. Do not call in lieu of sending an email or telefax. If you submit on the tentative without appearing and the opposing party appears, the hearing will be conducted in your absence. This case has been assigned to Judge DeNoce for all purposes.

Absent waiver of notice and in the event an order is not signed at the hearing, the prevailing party shall prepare a proposed order and comply with CRC 3.1312 subdivisions (a), (b), (d) and (e). The signed order shall be served on all parties and a proof of service filed with the court. A "notice of ruling" in lieu of this procedure is not authorized.

For general information regarding Judge DeNoce and his courtroom rules and procedures, please visit: http://www.denoce.com

The court's tentative ruling is as follows:

The Court is inclined to grant Ds motion to compel Ps further response to Ds request for production of documents, set two Numbers 25 and 27. P is to serve Code compliant responses within 10 days with a privilege log and/or 3rd party redactions. No sanctions are imposed due to the lack of clarity as to whether discovery cut-off was extended. It appears that Judge Bysshe continued the trial at the MSC and there is no indication as to whether the discovery cut-off dates were also continued. Since the typical practice is to continue the discovery cut-off dates when the trial date is continued, this court adopts that finding.